

murder, is alike explicit, and to the point ; but how omit it. It is right the people should know these things, if they are true; and then, I fear not, they will "judge righteous judgment." They will longer condemn and stone the abolitionists ! We rejoice that the *faithful* anti-slavery advocates have made such an impression upon the minds of the people, that the *conscientious* are breaking their ties of connection with such slaveholding associations.

From the Herald of Freedom.

We have before us a copy of this paper of the 2d December. O'Connell's withering reply to the Sinnati ropealers, is published in this number, showing that even the most ardent of the Sinnati

lishes it, that the South may be frightened from repeal sympathies—but in his spite towards al, he does anti-slavery grand service. In the

*The Annexation of Texas.*—The New-York Evening Post announces the determination of its editor to battle to the last, in opposition to the annexation.

perpetuate slavery in the United States. We  
 have no obligation to file battling in any manner, be

The 21st rule of the House of Representatives, familiarly called the "gag rule," forbids the reception of petitions *against slavery*, and under this rule they are disposed of in a summary manner. Upon this subject the Evening Post suggests that this rule or gag law, which has been made to exclude from the consideration of Congress all topics connected with slavery, will operate upon any such recommendation as that suggested by it must be impartial at least in its injury—

here is a great deal of force in this, and we feel  
poor to know how some of the *peculiar* and *ex-*  
*traneous* friends of the South will get over or round  
the old saw hath it, "that it is a poor rule that  
no man can live by," and if Congress adopt a  
prohibiting petitions or memorials, *a general* *sin-*  
gle, we confess we are not able to see with what  
of justice they can allow petitions or argu-  
ments in *their* *favor*. Will those who have always  
used the "gag law," stand quietly by and see the  
act of it violated in one case, and yet submit to  
disregard enforcement in another? "We shall see  
when we shall see."

There are of those who think that Congress has no  
right to adopt such a rule as the one alluded to, and

ment in its favor. But when the Constitution is violated by the passage of a rule, we do not see it should not be enforced on all sides. It seems that the editor of the New Orleans Courier, the next day, scolded the editor of the Tropic for his failure, to which the Tropic of the 29th, thus replied:— "There are some people resident in slave States, who deem it necessary to be constantly on the *qui vive* to display their devotion to what they are used to call the "rights of the South," and who constantly clamoring against the "abolitionists," "traitors," "riffians," &c. &c. These noisy champions of southern interests, are generally men who,

place, have *nonatural* sympathy with the Southern institutions, and, feeling this to be true, endeavor to make up for the deficiency by noisy and violent denunciations of all who doubt the wisdom or the necessity of the institution of slavery. Such men are the worst slaves in creation, and are entitled to the contempt only of those whose favor they seek to win by their servile and sycophantic course. With our friends of the South, we seek no alliance; we do not their services, nor will we have their friendship.

The editor who writes this article, and who penned the paragraph which has aroused the ire of the Cou-  
claims the privilege of expressing his senti-

where he passes. He does not hold himself  
enable to any one who may choose to set himself  
as a judge of what is, and what is not the inter-  
ior the duty of the slave States. Himself a  
thron, born, reared, and educated in a slave State,  
and to the South by the holiest and strongest ties  
nature, he begs to be pardoned if he objects to be-

as," upon any question affecting the rights, the honor or the interests of the South. It is quite likely that he feels as deep an interest in the welfare of native land, as it is possible for the editor of the *British side of the Courier* to feel; and it is probable, that he would as readily oppose any infringement of the rights of the South, as guaranteed by the constitution, as the most clamorous locofoco in the land. Thus situated, it is a matter of the smallest possible consequence whether his "manner" of denouncing the South, meets the approbation of "southerners" or northerners. He defends his home, when attacked, in his own way, without stopping to inquire whom it may please or offend.

that we had never seen anything approaching an argument in its favor. We now repeat it, and go farther, and say that no argument can be made to sustain it. The Courier may fume, and fret, and pronounce as much as it likes—but the editor, with his ability, all his sophistry, cannot make a sensible argument in its favor. We contend for all that the Courier claims, as to the *power of Congress over subject of slavery*, and we deny what Mr. Van Rensselaer says, to wit, that Congress has the right to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia; but for all that, we do not recognize the power of the House of Representatives to establish the 21st rule. The declaration that Congress has no power over the sub-

gress can stop the mouths, and stifle the voices of the people upon nearly all the great political questions of the day!

The locofoco party asserts that Congress has no power to establish a *national bank*; a portion of the party declare it has no power to enact a *tariff law protection*; another portion, that it has no power to *distribute the proceeds of the public lands*.

Will the Courier dare to assert that because a majority of the members of Congress believe each of these measures we have designated, unconstitutional, not within the power of Congress, that the voices of those who believe differently could be stifled by a rule similar to the one which prohibits the re-

planters of Louisiana have frequently petitioned Congress for protection upon sugar. Let us suppose that the free trade Congress assembled at Washington, and that first-rate democrat, and sugar planter, John Slidell, should be charged with a petition urging Congress to impose a duty of four cents a pound on sugar, to protect our planters from the ruinous competition of the Cuba planters? The free traders, believing that Congress had no power to tax in the prayer, would adopt a rule *proscribing all petitions in favor of a duty on sugar*. Are not the cases precisely similar? And yet, at that would the people of the South say to such a measure? Would they not denounce it as an infraction of the rights of the people?

of petition? And yet the miserable and dim-  
petence advanced by the Courier, would be the  
y argument in its favor!

We tell the Courier, that the 21st rule is a viola-  
of one of the dearest rights of freemen, the right  
petition, and it is one which the American people  
I never tamely surrender. When the day arrives  
Congress can tell the people what they may or  
y not petition for, American liberty will be a  
ekery, and freedom of speech an empty sound.  
The 21st rule has been opposed ere now by men

This gives us a new idea of the probable *origins* of  
a tority of those editors at the South, who have been  
ding the South to madness against manly discussion  
inquiry.







